

Appln. No.: 09/997,391
Amendment Dated March 6, 2006
Reply to Office Action of December 6, 2005

MATP-617US

Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1-4, 9 and 11-15 have been amended. Claims 22-24 have been added. No new material is introduced herein. Claim 8 has been canceled. Claims 1-6 and 8-24 are pending.

Support for the amendments to claims 1, 11 and 15, can be found in the disclosure, for example, paragraph [0022] (for storing speech files in the information appliance); paragraphs [0024] and [0042]-[0044] (aural prompts, input commands and navigation of speech files on the information appliance); and Figs. 2-4.

Claims 1, 2 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Van Kommer (U.S. Pat. No. 6,678,659). This ground for rejection is overcome by the amendment to claim 1. In particular, Van Kommer does not disclose or suggest:

- (e) receiving and storing the speech files in the information appliance transmitted in step (d);
- (f) presenting a sequence of aural prompts;
- (g) navigating through the stored speech files in the information appliance, responsive to the aural prompts, to extract a section of the stored speech files;
- (h) presenting the extracted section of the stored speech files extracted in step (g) through audio speakers

as required by amended claim 1.

Van Kommer discloses, in Fig. 1, a voice teleservice system including a centralized platform 1 which manages dialog with a user when used as an interactive system (Col. 3, lines 54-57) and includes voice analysis means (Col. 4, lines 7-9). Network access points 2 are connected to network 4 and temporarily store voice messages from platform 1 via network 4 (Col. 4, line 65-Col. 5, line 5). Van Kommer does not disclose presenting a sequence of aural prompts or navigating through the stored speech files in the information appliance responsive to the aural prompts, as required by claim 1. Van Kommer, instead performs bidirectional communication between user 30 and platform 1 over packet transmission network 4 (Col. 6, lines 8-35). According to Van Kommer, in bidirectional communication, prompts and responses are sent between access point 2 and platform 1 in order to provide information from the platform 1 to the user 30. Van Kommer is silent regarding navigating through stored speech files in the information appliance responsive to a sequence of aural prompts. Thus, Van Kommer does not include all of the features of claim 1.

Appln. No.: 09/997,391
Amendment Dated March 6, 2006
Reply to Office Action of December 6, 2005

MATP-617US

Because Van Kommer does not disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 1, claim 1 is not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Van Kommer. Because claims 2 and 6 include all of the limitations of claim 1 from which they depend, claims 2 and 6 are not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Van Kommer.

Claims 3-4, 11 and 13-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Kommer in view of Hong et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,737,030). Claims 3 and 4, however, include all of the limitations of claim 1 from which they depend and are patentable over Van Kommer for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Hong et al. does not provide the deficiencies of Van Kommer because it does not disclose or suggest 1) converting text files to speech files at the remote location, 2) storing the speech files at the remote location, 3) extracting and transmitting requested portions of the speech files to an information appliance or 4) navigating through stored speech files in the information appliance responsive to a sequence of aural prompts, as required by claim 1.

Hong et al. includes an electronic program device which allows a user to watch a program image as well as a character guide. In Hong et al., the programming guide text may be applied to a voice synthesizer to be reproduced using speakers. (Col. 7, lines 1-16). Hong et al. however, does not store any speech files at a remote location after they are synthesized. Hong et al. only stores the text information from the electronic programming guide. Hong et al. further does not present a sequence of aural prompts and navigate through stored speech files in the electronic program guide device responsive to aural prompts.

The cited art, taken singularly or in combination do not disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 1. Accordingly, claims 3 and 4, which include all of the features of claim 1 from which they depend are also not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Kommer in view of Hong et al.

The rejection to claim 11 is overcome by the amendment to claim 11. Although not identical to claim 1, claim 11 includes features similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 1. Claim 11 requires 1) that the EPG text data be converted into audio data and stored at the server, 2) that received EPG audio data transmitted from the server is stored by the STB, 3) that commands are entered responsive to a sequence of aural prompts or 4) a section of the EPG data stored in the STB is processed responsive to the commands. Van Kommer and Hong

Appln. No.: 09/997,391
Amendment Dated March 6, 2006
Reply to Office Action of December 6, 2005

MATP-617US

et al. are described above. Neither Van Kommer, Hong et al. nor their combination disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 11.

Because Van Kommer and Hong et al., either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 11, claim 11 is not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Kommer in view of Hong et al. Because claims 13 and 14 include all of the limitations of claim 11 from which they depend, claims 13 and 14 are not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Kommer in view of Hong et al.

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Kommer in view of Oh (U.S. Pat. No. 6,141,642). Claim 5, however, includes all of the limitations of claim 1 from which it depends and is patentable over Van Kommer for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Oh does not provide the deficiencies of Van Kommer because it does not disclose or suggest 1) converting text files to speech files at the remote location, 2) storing the speech files at the remote location, 3) extracting and transmitting requested portions of the speech files to an information appliance or 4) navigating through stored speech files in the information appliance responsive to a sequence of aural prompts, as required by claim 1.

Oh discloses a multiple language text to speech processing apparatus that is used to convert multiple language text into audio wave data (Col. 1, line 55 - Col. 2, line 5). Oh does not suggest storing the converted speech files at a remote location or extracting and transmitting requested portions of the speech files to an information appliance. Oh further does not present a sequence of aural prompts and navigate through stored speech files in an information appliance responsive to the aural prompts.

The cited art, taken singularly or in combination do not disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 5, which includes all of the features of claim 1 from which it depends is also not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Kommer in view of Oh.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Kommer in view of Houser et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,774,859). This ground for rejection is overcome by the cancellation of claim 8.

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Kommer in view of Cannon et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,510,209). Claim 9, however, includes all of the

Appln. No.: 09/997,391
Amendment Dated March 6, 2006
Reply to Office Action of December 6, 2005

MATP-617US

limitations of claim 1 from which it depends and is patentable over Van Kommer for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Cannon et al. does not provide the deficiencies of Van Kommer because it does not disclose or suggest 1) converting text files to speech files at the remote location, 2) storing the speech files at the remote location, 3) extracting and transmitting requested portions of the speech files to an information appliance or 4) navigating through stored speech files in the information appliance responsive to a sequence of aural prompts, as required by claim 1.

The invention in Cannon et al. allows a user to program a VCR when away from the house via a telephone which has been adapted for programming the VCR (Col. 3, lines 20-40). Cannon et al. does not disclose or suggest storing converted speech files or extracting, from memory, requested portions of the speech files at a remote location. Cannon et al. further can not disclose navigating through stored speech files in an information appliance responsive to a sequence of aural prompts, where the stored speech files in the information appliance have been transmitted from the remote location.

The cited art, taken singularly or in combination do not disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 9, which includes all of the features of claim 1 from which it depends is also not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Kommer in view of Cannon et al.

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Kommer in view of Stephens (U.S. Pat. No. 6,557,026). Claim 10, however, includes all of the limitations of claim 1 from which it depends and is patentable over Van Kommer for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Stephens does not provide the deficiencies of Van Kommer because it does not disclose or suggest 1) converting text files to speech files and storing the speech files at a remote location, 2) extracting and transmitting requested portions of the speech files to an information appliance or 3) navigating through stored speech files in the information appliance responsive to a sequence of aural prompts, as required by claim 1.

Stephens disclose a notice system 200, in Fig. 2, that allows a client 204 to periodically pull news from data sources 218, 220 and 222 that do not push stories to a client 204 (Col. 10, line 1-4). Client 204 generates a news page that is automatically refreshed as a function of the arrival of new stories (Col. 9, lines 51-56). Although Stephens disclose that client 204 and remote services 216 can each include a TTS engine 208 and 226, respectively (Col. 9, lines 56-62), Stephens does not suggest that text files are converted and stored as speech files at remote services 216. Stephens further does not suggest that requested portion of the speech

Appln. No.: 09/997,391
Amendment Dated March 6, 2006
Reply to Office Action of December 6, 2005

MATP-617US

files are extracted from the remote location. Stephens, instead pushes or pulls new stories from data sources. Stephens further does not disclose or suggest navigating through stored speech files in the client 204 responsive to a series of aural prompts. Stephens, instead, automatically refreshes a news page with the arrival of new stories.

The cited art, taken singularly or in combination do not disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 10, which includes all of the features of claim 1 from which it depends is also not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Kommer in view of Stephens.

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Kommer in view of Hong et al. and further in view of Houser et al. Claim 12, however, includes all of the limitations of claim 11 from which it depends and is patentable over Van Kommer for at least the same reasons as claim 11.

Hong et al. is described above. Houser et al. does not provide the deficiencies of Van Kommer because it does not disclose or suggest 1) that the EPG text data be converted into audio data and stored at the server, 2) that received EPG audio data transmitted from the server is stored by the STB, 3) that commands are entered responsive to a sequence of aural prompts or 4) a section of the EPG data stored in the STB is processed responsive to the commands, as required by claim 11.

Houser et al. uses a speech recognition system at a terminal unit for implementing spoken control of devices. Utterances are received from a user and processed to implement tasks at the terminal unit (Col. 23, lines 38-50). The invention in Houser et al. does not convert text to speech files. Instead, it converts speech to text. Thus Houser can not disclose or suggest the conversion and storage of text files to audio data as required by claim 11. Houser et al. further can not disclose or suggest that received EPG audio data transmitted from the server is stored by the STB or that commands are entered responsive to a sequence of aural prompts or that a section of the EPG data stored in the STB is processed responsive to the commands.

The cited art, taken singularly or in combination do not disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 11. Accordingly, claim 12, which includes all of the features of claim 11 from which it depends is also not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Kommer in view of Hong et al. and further in view of Houser et al.

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Lumelsky (U.S. Pat. No. 6,081,780) in view of Houser et al. and further in view of Stephens. This ground

Appln. No.: 09/997,391
Amendment Dated March 6, 2006
Reply to Office Action of December 6, 2005

MATP-617US

for rejection is overcome by the amendment to claim 15. In particular, Lumelsky does not disclose or suggest:

... a processor coupled to the modem for (a) communicating on the network, (b) periodically receiving speech files from the network, (c) storing the speech files in the memory device and (d) providing a sequence of aural navigation prompts...

... a receiver for accepting input commands from a remote control, the input commands entered responsive to a sequence of aural navigation prompts ...

...an audio speaker configured with the processor to present the sequence of aural navigation prompts ...

...the processor responsive to the input commands accepted by the receiver for (a) extracting a portion of the speech files stored in the memory device and (b) sending the extracted portion of the speech files to the audio speaker...

as required by amended claim 15.

Lumelsky describes a system that uses a Text-to-Speech (TTS) system to convert text into a string of phonemes (Col. 8, lines 60-63). The string of phonemes is further enhanced with prosody parameters to form a composite encoded speech (CES) signal (Col. 9, lines 7-9). The CES files are stored at the server and may be requested by a user. The requested CES file is transmitted to a user terminal 301 which includes a system memory that holds the CES file. The user terminal processes the CES file "using one or more recorded allophone dictionaries 315," to synthesize the voice (Col. 10, lines 53-61). Thus, Lumelsky does not disclose or suggest that a processor periodically receives speech files from a network or that the processor sends an extracted portion of the speech files to an audio speaker. The CES files are not speech files but encoded files that represent speech. This can be seen because the CES files can not be presented through audio speakers, as required by claim 15 but must first be processed by one or more allophone dictionaries to convert them to speech. In other words, the CES files are partially converted speech files. They are not, however, speech files as required by claim 15. Furthermore, Lumelsky provides CES files to the user at the user terminal only when the user requests them.

Lumelsky further discloses, in Fig. 4, using a microphone 327 to input spoken commands to control audio playback including reverse, forward and fast forward on audio signals at an amplifier/playback controller 324 component (Col. 21, lines 5-16). Lumelsky does not disclose or suggest 1) that a receiver accepts input commands from a remote control that are entered responsive to a sequence of aural prompts or 2) that the processor extracts a portion of the speech files stored in the memory device responsive to the input commands accepted by the receiver. Lumelsky is silent regarding entering input commands responsive to a sequence of aural prompts such that the processor extracts a portion of the speech files stored in the

Appln. No.: 09/997,391
Amendment Dated March 6, 2006
Reply to Office Action of December 6, 2005

MATP-617US

memory device responsive to the input commands. Thus, Lumelsky does not include all of the features of amended claim 15.

Houser et al. and Stephens et al. are described above. Neither Houser et al. nor Stephens nor their combination provide the deficiencies of Lumelsky because they do not disclose suggest 1) a processor coupled to a network through a modem which periodically receives speech files from the network, 2) that a receiver accepts input commands from a remote control that are entered responsive to a sequence of aural navigation prompts or 3) that the processor extracts a portion of the speech files stored in the memory device responsive to the input commands accepted by the receiver, as required by claim 15. Because neither Lumelsky, Houser et al., Stephens nor their combination disclose the limitations of claim 15, claim 15 is not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lumelsky in view of Houser et al. and further in view of Stephens.

Claims 16-19 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lumelsky in view of Houser et al., in view of Stephens and further in view of Hong et al. Claim 16-19 and 21, however, include all of the limitations of claim 15 from which they depend and are patentable over Lumelsky, Houser et al. and Stephens for at least the same reasons as claim 15.

Hong et al. is described above. Hong et al. does not make up for the deficiencies of Lumelsky, Houser et al. and Stephens because it does not disclose or suggest 1) a processor coupled to a network through a modem which periodically receives speech files from the network, 2) that a receiver accepts input commands from a remote control that are entered responsive to a sequence of aural prompts or 3) that the processor extracts a portion of the speech files stored in the memory device responsive to the input commands accepted by the receiver, as required by claim 15.

The cited art, taken singularly or in combination do not disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 15. Accordingly, claims 16-19 and 21, which include all of the features of claim 15 from which they depend are also not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lumelsky in view of Houser et al., in view of Stephens and further in view of Hong et al.

Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lumelsky in view of Houser et al., further in view of Stephens, further in view of Hong et al. and further in view of Oh. Claim 20, however, includes all of the limitations of claim 15 from which it depends and is patentable over Lumelsky, Houser et al. and Stephens for at least the same reasons as claim 15.

Appln. No.: 09/997,391
Amendment Dated March 6, 2006
Reply to Office Action of December 6, 2005

MATP-617US

Hong et al. and Oh are described above. Neither Hong et al., Oh nor their combination make up for the deficiencies of Lumelsky, Houser et al. and Stephens because they do not disclose or suggest 1) a processor coupled to a network through a modem which periodically receives speech files from the network, 2) that a receiver accepts input commands from a remote control that are entered responsive to a sequence of aural navigation prompts or 3) that the processor extracts a portion of the speech files stored in the memory device responsive to the input commands accepted by the receiver, as required by claim 15.

The cited art, taken singularly or in combination do not disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 15. Accordingly, claim 20, which includes all of the features of claim 15 from which it depends is also not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lumelsky in view of Houser et al., further in view of Stephens, further in view of Hong et al. and further in view of Oh.

Claims 22-24 have been added. Claims 22-24 include all of the features of respective claims 1, 11 and 15 from which they depend. No new matter is introduced herein. Support for these claims can be found, for example, paragraph [0049]. Accordingly, claims 22-24 are patentable over the cited art.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-6 and 8-21 and allow newly added claims 22-24.

Respectfully submitted,


Kenneth N. Nigon, Reg. No. 31,549
Attorney for Applicants

KNN/DMG/ap/pb

Dated: March 6, 2006
P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge payment to Deposit Account No. 18-0350 of any fees associated with this communication.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being filed via Facsimile Transmission to Facsimile No. 1-571-273-8300 addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on:

March 6, 2006


Patricia C. Boccella

PCB_1:\MATP\617US\03.02.06AMEND.DOC

Page 16 of 16